

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

Upon review of the Notice of Removal (#1) and the First Amended Class Action Complaint and Jury Demand (#14), this court is uncertain whether it has subject matter jurisdiction over this case. Defendant's notice of removal states that "Plaintiff is a citizen of Nevada and MetLife is a citizen of New York." (Notice of Removal (#1) ¶ 15.) Plaintiff alleges in her amended complaint that "Defendant Met Life has its principal place of business in New York." (First Am. Compl. (#14) ¶ 4.)

¹ See *Fifty Associates v. Prudential Ins. Co.*, 446 F.2d 1187, 1190 (9th Cir. 1970).

¹ Although the Class Action Fairness Act creates subject matter jurisdiction when “any member of a class of plaintiffs is a citizen of a State different from any defendant[,]” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A), the only parties mentioned in the notice of removal and amended complaint are Jamie Clark and Metropolitan Life

1 (holding that allegations were insufficient to establish diversity jurisdiction when they failed to set
2 forth a corporation's state of incorporation). As the removing party, Defendant has the burden of
3 establishing federal jurisdiction. *See Wilson v. Republic Iron & Steel. Co.*, 257 U.S. 92, 97 (1921).
4 The court will therefore order proof on the issue of whether the citizenship of any member of
5 Plaintiff's purported class is different from Defendant's citizenship. *See* 28 U.S.C. 1332(d)(2)(A).

6 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant is granted 10 days to establish whether the
7 parties in this case satisfy 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A). Plaintiff is granted 5 days to file a response.
8 No reply is required.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED this 26th day of January 2009.



12 LARRY R. HICKS
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Insurance Company.

26